

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. IV, No. 18

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

October 15, 1974

Budget Cutters See Lots of Plump Targets in R & D Funds

Like occupants of an overcrowded lifeboat in troubled waters, the inhabitants of the scientific community know that much will have to go overboard to appease the anti-inflationary sharks in government budget offices. But, with the budget for the next fiscal year less than three months away from the printers, rampant uncertainty is about all that can be discerned around the selection process.

Nevertheless, a basic element in the ranking of priorities for sacrifice is that research and development put in a dismal performance in advising President Ford as to what it might contribute to the restraint of inflation (SGR Vol. IV, No. 17). The reality, of course, is that in the shortterm, it has precious little to offer. As NSF Director H. Guyford Stever, who doubles as the President's science adviser, wisecracked to a Senate subcommittee last week (see p. 5), when invitations were issued to the R & D "mini-summit," the general response was that "R & D contributes to inflation." The initial product of that mini-summit was a draft paper that produced so much dismay in several of Stever's fellow conferees that they fretfully persuaded him to give them an opportunity to work it over. Even so, the version that Stever finally carried to the summit — where the President was out of the hall while Stever recited it — was so diffuse and non-specific in terms of responding to Mr. Ford's request for recommendations for action, that there was no surprise when R&D failed to receive mention in the President's address to Congress on Oct. 8.

Defenders of the mini-summit contend that the President asked of R&D a silly question, and, inevitably, got a silly answer. For example: With Mr. Ford widely confronted with forecasts of imminent economic catastrophe, Stever's presentation concluded by citing Benjamin Franklin as "the first apostle of frugality and the patron saint of savings accounts," — which suggests that the Adviser's preparatory research extended at least as far as the promotional literature of the savings and loan industry. "While these features are central to our present concerns," he continued, "(Franklin) was also a successful businessman and an internationally known scientist with a remarkable talent for invention...I suggest that the thrust of our present planning to combat inflation has much to gain from consideration of the efforts of this unusual man at the beginning of our unusual republic."

Against this background of "advice" that probably rendered Mr. Ford and his advisers incredulous, the hard facts are that R&D presents a plump target for the knife, with big-budget research institutions high on the list for

cutting. And, as usual, high-energy physics, whose relevance to the struggle against inflation is yet to be claimed by the prodigiously imaginative practitioners of that arcane trade, is slated for surgery.

The particulars are as follows: With the Fermi accelerator, at Batavia, Ill., consuming ever greater portions of an overall AEC accelerator budget that has actually declined in purchasing power in recent years, the Office of Management and Budget has looked over the field and singled out for extinction the \$14-million-a-year Zero Gradient Synchrotron (ZGS) at the Argonne National Laboratory, near Chicago. The scientific merit of this decision is open to question, but politically it's a plum, since the Fermi machine and the ZGS are in the same state, and neither Illinois, nor its neighboring states, can argue, as they

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

House-Senate conferees have not yet settled the fate of the National Institute of Education (NIE), for which the Senate decreed a zero appropriation (SGR Vol. IV, No. 16), but Senator Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash.), NIE's chief tormentor, has indicated that he'll approve a \$70 million budget — \$130 million was requested — if NIE is dismantled and its work turned over to the Office of Education.

That HEW inquiry into alleged industry favoritism at the Food and Drug Administration is motionless, following the resignation of Theodore Cooper, deputy to Assistant Secretary of Health Charles C. Edwards, as chairman of the inquiry panel (SGR Vol. IV, No. 16). Cooper dropped out after FDA employees who made the allegations complained that Edwards formerly headed FDA and that many of the episodes they reported occurred while he was the boss.

Lowell J. Paige, NSF's Assistant Director for Education since October 1973, has been named Acting Deputy Director of the Foundation, replacing Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, who resigned to become chancellor of the University of Missouri-Rolla.

Pie in the Sky: NASA's chief of nutrition, receiving an award for "development of sound and nutritious food and food systems to be used under zero gravity conditions," responded with the remark that the experience obtained in feeding astronauts "may accelerate solutions to some of the basic problems of feeding the general population."

Women Chemists' Starting Pay Tops Men's for First Time

The American Chemical Society has announced that, for the first time since it has been keeping track of such matters, the starting salary for women chemists is higher this year than that for men.

A survey of chemists and chemical engineers who were graduated this summer has turned up the fact that women are being paid on average 5 per cent more than men. Ten years ago, they could expect to earn only 86 per cent of the average salary paid to men.

That fact may indicate that employers are at last giving favorable treatment to women and members of minority groups, but, as the ACS points out, "years of unequal employment practices towards experienced

women and minority chemists are still reflected in statistics from ACS members."

For a start, whereas the average salary of a chemist with a BS degree this year is \$16,000, a woman chemist with a BS degree and 10 to 14 years' experience is earning only about \$14,000 and a minority chemist with the same experience earns on average \$15,000.

Similarly, 3.5 percent of women chemists are unemployed, while the overall unemployment rate for ACS members is 1.4 per cent. Furthermore, the survey found that two-thirds of the 184 chemistry departments in colleges and universities offering PhD degrees had no women faculty members.

BUDGET CUTS (Continued from page 1)

successfully did in the contest to locate the Fermi laboratory in the midwest, that they are being excluded from the advantages of engaging in high-energy physics research.

To carry out the death sentence, OMB sought the advice of a specially constituted AEC-NSF committee, co-chaired by the AEC's director of physical research, John Teem, and the director of NSF's Science and Technology Policy Office, Russell Drew. What OMB asked was not *whether* the ZGS should be cut off, but, rather, what steps should be taken to shut it down "at the earliest reasonable time." The committee naturally turned to the high-energy community for recommendations, and, as might have been expected from a group that has successfully endured in the shadows of many knives over the past decade, the outcome was worthy of James. D. St. Clair. Consequently, the final advice to OMB was that there is "no scientific reason to shut down at this time," and that OMB should accept the concept of "a relatively remote shutdown date."

To further boggle the thoughts of the people who manage the budget books, the committee recommended that late 1978 should be considered as the earliest shutdown date, but that if the high-energy physics budget doesn't expand by that time to allow continued operations, the ZGS should be considered as a "leading" but by no means "unique" candidate for termination. In the meantime, the committee suggested, the accelerators that the AEC supports at Brookhaven, Stanford, as well as the Fermi accelerator, should be reviewed two years from now to determine their relative scientific merit and financial requirements.

As an exercise in the obfuscatory arts, the report instantly acquires masterpiece status, but the fiscal realities are such that ZGS cannot be considered long for this world. The Fermi machine, which is the big enchilada of high-energy physics, currently consumes \$34.9 million of a total high-energy budget of \$131 million. That total is not likely to rise much, if at all next year, but, meanwhile, Fermi has asked the AEC for \$60 million for next year. The AEC, in its submission to OMB, has reduced the request to

\$46 million, but no matter how the pie is eventually sliced, something has to go overboard, and the ZGS is the prime candidate.

Another big institution with justifiable jitters is the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), which Caltech operates under contract to NASA, at an annual cost of \$168 million. Since JPL's principal activity is deep-space research, an endeavor that is now as saleable as 12-cylinder sedans, the laboratory has been scratching hard to find some new business, and inevitably has been working hard to apply its costly facilities to pollution and energy problems. Thus, it was recently announced that General Motors Research Laboratories has awarded JPL a \$377,000 contract for research to reduce automotive emissions. The sum, however, is in the petty cash range for JPL, and, though it has been picking brains nationwide in its quest for new business, one formerly high-placed veteran of government research affairs privately offers the prophecy that JPL's life expectancy may be no more than five years.

Meanwhile, the rest of the space establishment abounds with gloom, as was evident earlier this month at a meeting on the future of the space program that the Smithsonian Institution held at Newport, R.I., for NASA. The proceedings were off the record, but from what's emerged, it appears that there was a shortage of confidence about the agency's future in space, accompanied by a good deal of hope about getting into terrestrial matters, such as low-pollution energy.

As far as health-related matters are concerned, the affairs of NIH are so bound up with Congressional passions and politically motivated campaigns against this or that disease that it is difficult to know what will emerge at the conclusion of the budgetary journey. But as reported here earlier (SGR Vol. IV, No. 17), the Administration's chief for health affairs, HEW Assistant Secretary Charles C. Edwards, is of the opinion that "we could probably cut a billion dollars out of the federal health budget and it wouldn't have an appreciable impact on the health and well being of the American people." With the head man for health talking that way, Mr. Ford's budget cutters are not likely to feel restrained. —DSG

EPA Research Activities Battered in New Report

For the second time in less than a month, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been told that its research programs are a shambles.

The latest criticism is contained in a 105-page report put together by staff members of the Senate Public Works Committee — a source which is usually sympathetic to the EPA and which is in a position to make sure that its complaints are heeded. The report has been sent to EPA Administrator Russell Train and it should be published by the committee in the next few weeks.

Taken together with the harsh analysis of EPA's research planning recently completed by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences (SGR Vol. IV No. 17) and earlier criticism of EPA's water pollution research by the General Accounting Office, the Congressional study is going to be a millstone around EPA's neck for some time to come.

Requested by Senator Joseph M. Montoya (D-N.M.), chairman of the Public Works subcommittee on economic development, the study is probably the most savage indictment of EPA's Office of Research and Development so far. Montoya described it in a recent Senate speech as a "shocking" catalogue of facts.

The study's conclusions, Montoya said, are that "the research planning system of EPA is hopelessly confused and exaggerated, and that hundreds of man-years are now being misdirected and wasted." The problem, he said, "results primarily from the continued absence of any comprehensive EPA environmental strategy paper, which is long overdue." Nevertheless, he said, "the aptitude and attitude of EPA's environmental scientists remains excellent."

Eleven specific faults in EPA's research planning are listed in the study, most of which reinforce the conclusions of the Academy committee. Chief among the criticisms is the complaint that the headquarters staff in Washington is top-heavy and exercises "disruptive influence over the nature of the work and the detail of the work" performed in EPA laboratories.

Intrusion of headquarters staff at the working level of environmental research projects, the report asserts, upsets relationships between laboratory directors and the directors of the National Environmental Research Centers. And in any case, the study suggests, there is insufficient scientific capability among the Washington staff for it to become intimately involved with the execution of research projects.

The study also claims that the planning process is so complicated that research ideas which originate in the field take too long to filter through the bureaucracy, that there is insufficient independent review of in-house research projects, that the planning system encourages concentration on short-term goals while neglecting longer term objectives, and that much senior staff time is spent in disguising research tasks to avoid criticism that the work encroaches

on another laboratory's territory.

Virtually all the criticisms were endorsed by a majority of the laboratory directors interviewed for the study, but were mostly rejected by a majority of the senior headquarters staff. One criticism, however, gained almost universal acceptance — that because EPA's research budget has remained fairly constant over the past three years, there has been a shift towards process and effects R&D, which is manpower intensive, and away from technology R&D, which is capital intensive.

According to Montoya, these faults in the research planning system have caused EPA to neglect until much too late such issues as the possibility that exhaust catalysts may cause sulphuric acid mist, and the prospect of sewage sludge polluting prime beach resorts. "It is reassuring to know that the issue (of sulphuric acid mist) is now being fully assessed by EPA," Montoya said, "but 20-20 hindsight is no substitute for foresight in research."

The Senator also listed five other important areas in which he charges EPA has failed: "inadequate research on the economics or on the health effects of alternative decision strategies....inadequate research regarding suspended particulates other than acid aerosol mist, both in health health effect and in technological control....inadequate study of air quality maintenance region characteristics....inadequate and overdue flue gas desulphurization research into sources and effects of lead in the environment."

The study, together with the National Academy of Sciences' report, have been timed to reach EPA before the appointment of a new director of the Office of Research and Development. That post has been vacant since the resignation in May of Stanley M. Greenfield, and the White House should soon be sending a nomination to the Senate for approval.

It should be noted that the Senate Public Works committee will hold confirmation hearings on the nomination when it is made. A bruising public inquiry into EPA's research programs can be anticipated at those hearings.

Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation

Science & Government Report, published 22 times per year, at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20015; Publisher and editor, Daniel S. Greenberg, (same address); Stockholders owning or holding one percent or more of stock, Daniel S. Greenberg (same address). Extent and nature of circulation: Average number copies each issue during preceding 12 months/actual number of copies of single issue published nearest to filing date (Oct. 1, 1974): total no. of copies printed 2000/2000; paid circulation through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales: 0/0; mail subscriptions: 1737/1906; free distribution by mail, carrier, or other means: 65/80; copies distributed to news agents but not sold: 0/0; total distribution, 1802/1906; office use, left over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing: 198/14; total 2000/2000.

Ford Rejects Spending Increase for NIH Heart Research

President Ford has at last made public a revised national program for research into cardiovascular diseases, more than seven months after it was put together by the National Heart and Lung Institute (NHLI). But, like his predecessor, Ford has rejected the plan as too expensive.

Written by former NHLI Director Theodore Cooper and dated February 13, 1974, the revised plan is the first yearly update of the research blueprint prescribed by the National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act (SGR Vol. III, No. 14). It adjusts a few priorities in the original plan and also recommends higher spending levels to explore further some of the research which has shown promise over the past year.

But, when he finally transmitted the revised plan to Congress on September 24, Ford made clear that his Administration has no intention of funding the program at the levels proposed. "That part of the report which deals with the future proposes certain expenditures for fiscal

years 1976 through 1980 which are in excess of what has been requested in the 1975 budget," Ford pointed out. He added that the plan "does not take into account the competing claims on the Federal budget at any time," which is not surprising since law imposes no such requirement on the drafters of the document.

Ford's message is that if the heart and lung program is funded at the levels proposed, it would syphon off funds from other areas of biomedical research — and that's a complaint which is often raised by members of the scientific community about both the cancer and the cardiovascular disease programs. But an official of NHLI told SGR that the revised plan represents the minimum level of effort necessary to meet the requirements of the National Heart and Lung Act.

In fact, the expenditures proposed fall well short of the authorizations levels approved by Congress in the original

(continued on p. 5)

Study Says Professional Societies Going Back to Sleep

A study prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has predicted that many American academic societies will soon begin to lose members, that they will shed the political and professional activities they have recently taken on, and that they will revert to staid organizations dominated by luminaries from elite institutions.

The reason is that many of the radicals and liberals who fought during the 1960s to make such previously moribund outfits as the American Physical Society take note of the political and professional concerns of their members are now turning their attention to academic unions.

In short, the study argues that younger scientists no longer look to learned societies to represent their professional concerns because such matters as equal employment opportunities and group insurance are being dealt with by collective bargaining at the campus level. And, if younger scientists find academic societies irrelevant to their immediate needs, they won't join.

But at the same time, many of the established scientists who fought against the radicals' attempts to broaden the base of the societies' activities will keep up their membership. The societies will then become "the more exclusive domain of eminent scholars and scientists from the nation's elite colleges and universities."

A drop in membership will, of course, also mean a drop in membership dues, with the result that many societies will lack the cash to "develop or maintain staff and machinery with the specific function of monitoring federal government activity or lobbying," the study suggests. It adds that societies will be unlikely "to move

further in the direction of accreditation programs," and that there will be less pressure on the societies to deal with broader issues related to membership employment. The net result will be that the societies will "once again begin to focus more exclusively on activities and programs related to the advancement and diffusion of knowledge — most importantly, on the publication of journals and the arrangement of scholarly meetings," the study predicts.

It all sounds very plausible, particularly when coupled with the fact that the leadership of many academic societies would like nothing better than to throttle activities and caucuses which sprang up at society meetings during the Vietnam war. In fact, there is already some evidence that the trends predicted in the Carnegie study are beginning to happen.

Radical activity has dropped off markedly at learned society meetings over the past couple of years, and collective bargaining on campuses is continuing to increase rapidly. Furthermore, the growth rate of the American Physical Society, for one, has slackened recently.

A notable exception to the trend, however, is likely to be the American Chemical Society, chiefly because the bulk of its members are employed in industry rather than in universities, and are therefore less affected by campus unionism. The ACS has also been shrewdly expanding its professional functions recently, so that it is becoming more relevant to the everyday concerns of its members.

(The study, *American Learned Societies in Transition*, is published by McGraw-Hill at \$6.95.)

Kennedy Rushes for Passage of New Science Policy Bill

It's not clear what the hurry's about, but with a dazzling spurt of speed, Senator Kennedy, in a matter of hours, earlier this month rammed through committee a catchall bill that incorporates: (1) the main features of his long-becalmed National Science Policy and Priorities Act (S. 32); (2) a bill (S. 2495) that is the leading Senate contender for restoring science advice to the White House; plus (3), another bill (S. 1686) that would establish a nationwide network of state science and technology offices.

The conglomerate bill bears the opaque title of the National Science Policy and Priorities for Science and Technology Act of 1974, and also bears the designation S.32, which, considering the rigidities of the sequential bill-numbering system in the Senate, took some doing this late in the session.

Kennedy introduced the bill at 6 p.m. on October 7; the following morning, he held two hours of hearings, at which NSF Director H. Guyford Stever was the leadoff witness. (He politely indicated he didn't think too well of the bill.) By 3 p.m., the bill had been approved by Kennedy's seven-member subcommittee, and by 6 p.m., it had been voted out by the 16-member Labor and

Public Welfare Committee.

The original S. 32, with a \$1.2 billion price tag for promoting civilian technology, passed the Senate, 82-10 in August, 1972, but never got a hearing in the House. The new S.32 is scaled down to a mere \$8 million, but even so, it is doubtful that there is time in this session for either house to complete action.

The main effect of Kennedy's action is to reaffirm his role as the Senate's leading proponent of the care and feeding of science and technology and their application to national problems. The provisions concerning White House science advice — calling for a three-member council to serve the President — were previously adopted by the Senate Commerce Committee and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. In the House, a related measure is yet to emerge from the Science and Astronautics Committee, where the prevailing opinion seems to be that it would be beneficial for the President to re-organize his science advisory system, but that, essentially, the matter is up to him.

The probable rationale for Kennedy's fast move is that a big Senate vote in behalf of reorganization might serve as a prod to the White House.

HEART (continued from p. 4)

Act, and the whole tone of the report stands in sober contrast to the shrill utterances of the NHLI's Advisory Board, which recently issued a strong denunciation of the Administration's lack of commitment to the heart research program.

The revised estimates for the research plan call for expenditures of \$496.1 million in FY 1976, compared with the \$309.3 million which the Administration proposed to spend this year. The plan also now calls for funding to rise to about \$540 million in FY 1978 and then to decline slightly towards FY 1980. Overall, the revised estimates would add about \$100 million a year to the original research plan.

One reason for the upward revision of the estimates is that extra administrative costs have been factored in, but most of the increase would go toward research which has already demonstrated some promise. Among the areas singled out in the report are arteriosclerosis, hypertension, prevention, control and education programs, and the designation of National Research and Demonstration Centers (three of which have already been established).

While the report quietly deplores the lack of funding for the NHLI, it also makes clear that equally damaging to the program has been the fact that the Institute has been chronically short of manpower, and will continue to be understaffed. The problem is that although the budget has been allowed to rise at a relatively modest rate, the Nixon

Administration imposed strict staff ceilings on the Institute. Thus, although the budget has increased from \$168 million in FY 1968 to a proposed level of \$309 million in FY 1975, NHLI staff has been allowed to increase from 609 to only 664 in the same period.

"These position allocations are substantially below our estimates of staffing needs" to carry out the revised program, the report states.

The revised plan, *National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Program: First Annual Report of the Director of NHLI*, is available from NHLI, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. 20014. DHEW Publication No. (NIH) 74-514.

AEC Confirms Big Cost Jump In Breeder Reactor Program

The Atomic Energy Commission has now confirmed that the estimated cost of the breeder reactor demonstration plant has increased by 250 percent over the past two years, and that the plant is expected to be completed in 1983 — three years behind schedule. As reported in SGR (Vol. IV, No. 15), the AEC now reckons that the plant will cost about \$1,736 billion to build and operate for five years; the estimate in 1972 was \$699 million. AEC says that its new figure takes into account inflation and anticipated construction delays.

House Reorganization Boosts Science Committee's Power

After nearly two years of jurisdictional turf fighting and six days of debate, the House of Representatives has finally completed a mild reorganization of its committee structure.

The changes, which were voted through immediately after President Ford had given Congress his economic pep talk, do not, however, result in the wholesale realignment that many reformers had hoped for, and they leave intact most of the Congressional power centers, such as the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Ways and Means.

But they will greatly expand the jurisdictional patch of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, by giving it legislative authority over virtually all non-nuclear energy research and development. The committee's name would also change to the Committee on Science and Technology.

The reforms were essentially written by a Democratic committee headed by Rep. Julia Hansen (D-Wash.) and they were adopted in preference to more radical changes proposed by a bipartisan committee chaired by Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.) (SGR Vol. III, No. 22).

At present, the Science and Astronautics Committee's responsibilities are essentially limited to oversight of the programs of NASA, NSF, and the National Bureau of Standards, and deliberations on general science policy matters. With the decline in the space program in recent years, the committee has been slipping in the pecking order of Congressional bodies.

It will now, however, get a considerable boost in responsibilities, chief of which is its expanded jurisdiction in energy matters. The committee is already deep into

energy research and development through a subcommittee chaired by Rep. Mike McCormack (D-Wash.), but it has always lacked authority to write legislation in that area unless the legislation was tied to NASA, NSF or NBS.

Now, however, the committee will pick up legislative authority for energy R&D from Commerce and Interior, to become the preeminent House committee in such matters. The reorganization has, however, explicitly left authority over nuclear energy in the hands of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, thanks to an amendment proposed on the floor by JCAE Chairman Melvin Price (D-Ill.).

It is important to note that these changes will now give the new Committee on Science and Technology legislative oversight over the non-nuclear programs of the Energy Research and Development Administration. In fact, on the day that the House finally reached agreement on committee reforms, a House-Senate Conference committee reported out a bill to establish ERDA.

In addition, the Science and Astronautics committee is set to pick up legislative authority over civil aviation R&D, environmental R&D, and the Weather Service. The latter acquisition would, however, split Congressional authority over oceanic and atmospheric affairs, with oceanography remaining under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine. Rep. Ken Hechler (D-W.Va.) received assurance during floor debate on the reorganization, however, that bills relating to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will now be referred jointly to the Merchant Marine and the Science and Technology Committee. — CN

Dixy Says Environment Protection Agency Plays Unfair

Still another public row has broken out between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency, with AEC Chairperson Dixy Lee Ray charging in a letter to EPA Administrator Russell Train that environmental regulations are seriously endangering the health of the nuclear power industry.

The nub of the dispute is a set of regulations governing thermal discharges from electric generating stations, which EPA published in the *Federal Register* on October 8. The regulations, issued under the requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, generally specify that thermal emissions from power plants must not adversely affect aquatic plant and animal life.

The AEC contends that the regulations could result in extensive modifications to some 55 nuclear generating stations which are already in operation, at a total cost of about \$2.1 billion.

While the regulations were being drawn up, AEC officials tried in vain to persuade EPA not to lump

nuclear stations in with all other power plants in the regulation, largely because nuclear plants have already been through extensive review under the terms of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The AEC is particularly miffed because EPA has already had a chance to examine each nuclear plant's cooling system when it reviewed the environmental impact statements published by AEC at the time the plants were proposed. The letter maintains that, for the 55 plants which may now have to be modified, "it was (previously) concluded that the environmental impacts from thermal effluents were not significant or sufficiently serious to warrant the costs of closed-cycle cooling systems."

EPA says in a preamble to the regulations, however, that "information and conclusion developed through the AEC (licensing) process should be considered and given due weight," but the final determination on whether or not power plants meet the new standards must rest with EPA regional Administrators.

Ford, Stever Confer on New White House Science Proposals

Something more serious than usual is stirring in connection with longstanding attempts to undo the Nixon decision to relocate presidential science advice from the White House to the Office of the Director of the National Science Foundation.

With leaders of the scientific community clamoring for a return to the presidential presence, and committees in both the House and Senate giving them sympathetic hearings, (SGR Vol. IV, No. 17), SGR has learned that President Ford conferred for about half an hour last month with NSF Director H. Guyford Stever to learn what the uproar is about.

Stever, meeting with Mr. Ford and several White House assistants, outlined the various proposals that are floating about. The President is said to have shown a good deal of interest in the subject, but did not commit himself to any of the schemes, which, though they vary in detail, agree that the President should have a science adviser, or advisers, on his personal or Executive Office staff.

Stever's own view of the matter, as most recently expressed, Oct. 8 before Senator Kennedy's NSF subcommittee, is that the present system is working well, and that the "President should have as large a measure of flexibility as possible in determining how best to satisfy his needs for advice and counsel in the Executive Office."

With an effective witness-chair manner, Stever pointed out that the staff resources that he has established at the Foundation in support of his role as Science Adviser are considerably more extensive than those that backed up the former White House Office of Science and Technology. Under questioning by Kennedy, he acknowledged that the Nixon reorganization excluded the Science Adviser from dealing with military R&D expenditures, but, as he pointed out, the essential ingredient in an advisory system is the receptivity to advice, and if the President feels the present arrangement is deficient, there is nothing to prevent him from changing it. In effect, he said that if the President is happy with the present system, no Act of Congress can force him to heed unwanted advice.

Stever said he has ranged far and wide in seeking recommendations for dealing with the problems that occupy him as Science Adviser, and though barraged with skeptical questions concerning whether he's getting through to the President, genially assured the committee that there are no grounds for concern.

"I want to assure the Committee," he said, "that, under the present arrangement, the new administration is using the science adviser on a range of topics dealing with international and domestic problems. The advice I have given has been based upon a synthesis of inputs from a broad base of scientific expertise both inside and outside the federal government."

Not dealt with directly was the durable question of whether the head of an agency in the R&D field should also

New Energy "Masterplan" Due

Yet another official "masterplan" will soon be forthcoming to guide federal support of energy research and development in coming years.

Though many may be under the impression that a final masterplan underlay the energy budget that President Nixon sent to Congress at the beginning of this year, the fact is that that isn't so. The newest masterplan, announced last month by Federal Energy Administrator John C. Sawhill, is due to be unveiled in November, and is said to recommend the spending of \$11 billion over five years.

Since the new plan will arrive toward the end of budget preparations for the fiscal year that starts next July 1, it is not likely to show up in the budget that President Ford will send to Congress early in 1975, which means that there will be ample time for another masterplan to be prepared for the budget that Mr. Ford will send to Congress in 1976.

be the adviser to the President on matter affecting his agency and others in the same area. The question, however, is of more interest to scholars of government organization than it is to those who run the day-to-day affairs of government. Yet to be produced is evidence that Stever's dual role has created any difficulties. He doesn't appear to be concerned about it, nor do the officials of supposedly competing agencies in the R&D business.

At this point, what seems likely, however, is that Ford will make some move to quiet the clamor, if only to maintain his record of being respectful toward Congress. But just how far he will go has not yet been determined.

Subscription Order Form—

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

- ☐ Renew my subscription
☐ Enter my subscription

for one year, \$58 ☐; two years, \$110 ☐
(Overseas airmail, \$10 additional per year.)

☐ check enclosed; ☐ please bill.

☐ Send a complimentary copy to:

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Federal Anti-Smoking Drive Faces Bleak Future

As any cigarette package will tell you, the federal government is officially committed to the proposition that "smoking is dangerous to your health." But while cigarette sales and the incidence of lung cancer are zooming, the government's anti-smoking program — already cut to token size in recent year — is being "reorganized" and may become non-existent.

Without any public announcement beyond a brief notice in the narrowly circulated *Federal Register*, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has decreed the relocation of its Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health from the Washington, D.C., area to the Center for Disease Control, in Atlanta, Ga.

Of the 30 fulltime employees of the Clearinghouse, at least 25 do not plan to make the move, and among them is Daniel Horn, who became director when the Clearinghouse was established in 1965, following publication of the Surgeon General's celebrated report, *Smoking and Health*. Horn told SGR that his plans are uncertain. He said that he will be abroad for the next few weeks and then will decide what to do next. However, he did not sound optimistic about the future of the Clearinghouse, which is to come under the jurisdiction of the newly created Bureau of Health Education. "We survived a remarkably long time," he said, adding that he wasn't certain as to whether the federal anti-smoking effort would continue.

At best, the Clearinghouse, which was responsible for developing education campaigns against smoking, never amounted to more than a token effort. Its budget peaked at \$2.5 million several years ago, but last year was cut back to \$1 million — after a scare period in which it was scheduled for no new funds.

HEW officials are yet to explain the shift to Atlanta or to confirm Horn's gloomy assessment of its implications. But the HEW Assistant Secretary for Health, Charles C.

Edwards, has previously voiced skepticism about the efficacy of efforts to persuade the public to look after its health. As noted here before (SGR Vol. IV, No. 16), HEW's five-year plan calls for "improved methods of evaluating health-education activities" — among them the anti-smoking campaign.

There can be no argument, of course, with the quest for improved evaluation methods, but they should be undertaken with the recognition that, relative to the promotional efforts of the tobacco industry, the US government never mounted more than a feeble campaign to discourage smoking.

After an initial reaction of alarm, the tobacco industry eventually came to regard the Clearinghouse as ineffective, but nonetheless valuable for creating the appearance of government activity against tobacco. Still, the *Tobacco Institute Newsletter*, published by the industry's lobbying arm in Washington, couldn't resist a chortle over the fate of Horn's organization. Its report stated: "CLEARINGHOUSE FOR SMOKING AND HEALTH, the govt.'s headquarters for fanciful propaganda attacks against tobacco for the past nine years, appears to be withering away...Its director, Daniel Horn, is openly seeking another assignment. Lesser staffers have already departed to other agencies and pursuits, and it's reported that Clearinghouse services are being reduced."

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT, © 1974 by Science & Government Report, Inc. All rights reserved. Daniel S. Greenberg, Editor and Publisher; Colin Norman, contributing Editor; Margot Daffron, Circulation Manager. Published 22 times per year at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20015. Subscription rate, \$58 a year; overseas airmail subscription, \$68. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. Vol. IV, No. 18, Oct. 15, 1974.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

